REVIEW OF THE CASE CONCERNING THE GENERIC NAMES *PATANGA* UVAROV, 1923, AND *VALANGA* UVAROV, 1923 (INSECTA, ORTHOPTERA) Z.N.(S.) 1761

By R. V. Melville
(*Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

I. *Introduction*

The documents in this case consist of an application by Dr. V. M. Dirsh for the determination of the type-species of *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923, under the plenary powers (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 235–8) and comments by 30 zoologists on it. Seven of these comments have been published (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** : 130–7, 275); the others do not make any specific proposals for action by the Commission, although their general sense is quite clear. The published proposals offer several alternative courses of action to the Commission. Although it would be possible to present these alternatives as a series of choices in a single Voting Paper to the Commission, it appears to me that their complexity is such that the Commission ought to have before it an expression of the general wish of the specialists involved before it takes a vote. The purpose of this paper is therefore to invite specialists to choose between the alternative solutions to a problem in which the choice depends on technical nomenclatural points. It is not difficult to understand, however, that the choice is basically (a) between the taxonomic and the applied approaches to the case and (b) between a complex and a direct method of approach. The history of the case is set out below.

2. Uvarov (1923a, p. 143) established a new genus *Valanga* with type-species by original designation (not, as stated by Dirsh, by subsequent selection by Bey-Bienko and Mistshenko, 1951) *Acridium nigricorne* Burmeister, 1838; and a new genus *Patanga* with type-species by original designation *Gryllus Locusta succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763. The former species was described and figured in Uvarov, 1923, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (9) **12**: 351–2, text-fig. 8B and the latter in Uvarov, *ibid.:* 465–7, text-figs. 1C, 2d, 3d, 7b, 8A, 8B. Both species were treated in agreement with what was then and still remains current use.

3. In his application to the Commission, Dirsh announced the discovery in the Linnean Collection of " a female specimen which agrees fairly well with Linnaeus' description and bears the label ' succinctus ', probably in Linnaeus' handwriting. It is almost certain that this is the specimen described by Linnaeus and that it is actually the type of the species. For the sake of formality I herewith designate it as neotype of *Gryllus succinctus* Linnaeus 1763 ". This specimen, however, belongs, not to the species known as *succinctus* both before and since 1923, but to *Acridium nigricorne* Burmeister, the type-species of *Valanga*. Since the type-specimen of this latter species is lost, Dirsh designated as its neotype the Linnean specimen of *Gryllus succinctus*. He further found that the oldest name available for the species long known as *succinctus* was *Acridium assectator* Fischer de Waldheim, 1838, and proposed

that the plenary powers be used to make that the type-species of *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923. He designated a neotype to replace the lost type of the species.

4. The position thus was that Dirsh had demonstrated that *Patanga* was a genus based on a misidentified type-species. Of the three possible methods provided to the Commission for dealing with such cases in Article 70a, he chose to propose the method laid down in Article 70a(i). The effect of this was to transfer the name *succinctus* from a species for which it had long been used, and which had become the type-species of *Patanga*, to a different species, long known as *nigricorne* Burmeister, the type-species of *Valanga*; and to give to the type-species of *Patanga* a name (*assectator*) that had never been used as the valid name of a taxon since its first publication.

5. Comments on Dirsh's paper have dealt with two aspects of his proposals. Nearly all draw attention to the undesirability of the kind of name-changing proposed, especially when it affects the type-species of genera. They also point out that both the species concerned are of great economic importance in the countries surrounding the Bay of Bengal and in South-East Asia, being cited under their familiar names in numerous reports by economic entomologists, pest control officers and their clients every year. They therefore urge that some means be found of preserving the names *succincta* and *nigricorne* in their accustomed senses, but they are not unanimous in the means suggested. The second aspect concerns the manner in which neotypes have been designated in this case: here again, various proposals are put forward.

II. *The Avoidance of Name-Changing*

6. Two methods have been suggested for stabilizing the specific names. One proposes the suppression of the Linnean specimen (which is a female; in this group it is preferable for nominal species to be based on male type-specimens) and the designation of a suitable neotype. The other proposes the suppression of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, and all subsequent usages prior to Uvarov, 1923, so as to validate the name with that author and date; this involves in addition the suppression of *assectator* and four other names (*fusilinea*, *inficita*, *rubescens* and *elongatum*, all of Walker, 1870). There is also a proposal to accept *assectator* as the name for the type-species of *Patanga*.

7. Dr. Key (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** : 130) at first suggested the suppression of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, and the designation of *assectator* as the type-species of *Patanga*; that name would be placed on the Official List together with *nigricorne* as the name of the type-species of *Valanga*. Later, however, in a letter dated 1 March 1967, he withdrew these proposals in favour of those put forward by Dr. Kevan (: 131), which were to designate Dirsh's neotype of *Acridium assectator* Fischer de Waldheim, 1833, as neotype of *Gryllus Locusta succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763. This procedure, which both Dr. Key and Dr. Kevan describe as " questionable ", is in fact agreed by both of them to be the simplest and most direct means of ensuring that both *succincta* and *nigricorne* continue to be used in their accustomed senses. Both agree that the practical considerations should outweigh the procedural ones and that, even if *assectator* must be accepted as the type-species of *Patanga*, *succincta* must by all means be prevented from becoming the type-species of *Valanga*.

8. Sir Boris Uvarov (: 132) proposed the suppression of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763 and all subsequent usages prior to his own work of 1923, and of *assectator* and the four names proposed by Walker, 1870, mentioned in paragraph 6 above, so as to validate the name " *Patanga succincta* Uvarov, 1923 ". Dr. Sabrosky (: 136) recommended the acceptance of *assectator* as the type-species of *Patanga* and of the remaining proposals of Dirsh's original paper (including the transfer of *succincta* from *Patanga* to *Valanga*). Professor Mayr (: 275) suggested either acceptance of the Kevan-Key proposal to designate Dirsh's neotype of *assectator* as the neotype of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, or, alternatively, the suppression of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763. Dr. Dirsh, in a letter dated 17 March 1967, was prepared to agree to the suppression of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, in favour of *assectator*, but not to the wholesale suppression of names needed to validate *succincta* Uvarov, 1923. He suggested that if *assectator* is not acceptable, then *fusilinea* Walker, 1870, be accepted as the type-species of *Patanga*.

9. Of the 24 other comments received, one, from a zoologist who did not wish his name to be published, favoured the validation of *succincta* Uvarov, 1923. The other 23 all pleaded, some of them in the most earnest and heartfelt language, for the stabilization of *succincta* and *nigricorne* in their accepted senses, without saying in detail how this should be achieved. They are: Dr. Y. Ramchandra Rao (*Bull.* **24** : 135); H. T. Pagden (*Penang, Malaysia*); Dr. M. L Roonwal and Dr. K. N. Katiyar (*University of Jodhpur, India*); Miss Moh Leng Kok (*College of Agriculture, Selangor, Malaysia*); Dr. G. Bey-Bienko (*Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.*); Dr. A. P. Kapur (*Director, Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta*); Dr. P. N. Chatterjee (*Forest Entomologist, Dehra Dun, India*); Dr. A. Newsam and B. Sripathi Rao (*Rubber Research Institute of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur*); Dr. J. A. Bullock (*University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur*); and Drs. G. Ashall, F. T. Bullen, P. T. Haskell, C. F. Hemming, D. Hollis, J. E. Moorhouse, G. Popov, M. J. Richards, J. Roffey, P. M. Symmons, Z. Waloff and K. Wardhaugh (*Locust Research Centre, London*). These comments come from academic workers, from workers in a variety of applied fields, and from a number of different countries. They show the importance of the practical aspects of the case.

III. *The Types of the Species*

10. Dr. Dirsh designated the Linnean specimen (a female) both as neotype of *Gryllus Locusta succinctus* and as " male neotype " of *Acridium nigricorne* Burmeister, 1838—an inconsistency that was pointed out by Uvarov (*Bull.* **24** : 132). Key (: 131), Uvarov (: 132) and Sabrosky (: 136) all say that, if the Linnean specimen is truly original, it can be the holotype, but not the neotype of *succinctus*. Mayr (: 275) drew attention to the fact, discussed by many authorities in the subject, that Linnaeus had no idea of the modern concept of types as name-bearers, implying that his specimens are not always of indisputably original status (there is, however, no objective test whereby it can be determined in every case whether a specimen in the Linnean collection is one originally used by Linnaeus, or whether it had been substituted by him or by another). Dirsh's designation of a neotype for *succinctus* is claimed to be invalid under Article 75

for two reasons: first, because a holotype exists (but if this is accepted, the name has to be transferred from the type-species of *Patanga* to the type-species of *Valanga*) and secondly because no confusion exists about the interpretation of the name. Willemse (: 136) says that no confusion exists about the interpretation of either *succincta* or *nigricorne.* Uvarov, in following up the logic of his proposal to validate the name *succincta* as from his own work of 1923, selected a lectotype for this species and designated a different neotype for *nigricorne* from the one designated by Dirsh. Kevan (: 131), followed by Key, proposed to designate Dirsh's male neotype of *assectator* as the neotype of *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763. Willemse held that all the type-designation of earlier contributors to the case were not only invalid but premature, since exhaustive revisory work has still to be done on both genera involved, especially on *Valanga.*

11. There seems to be some confusion of thought in the minds of those, for example Dr. Sabrosky and Dr. Willemse, who claim that there is no justification under Article 75 for the designation of neotypes in this case on the ground that no confusion exists about the use of the specific names *succincta* and *nigricorne.* It is true that no such confusion existed prior to Dirsh's application. Dirsh, however, not only showed that *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923, is based on a misidentified type-species, so that the intervention of the Commission using its plenary powers is obligatory, but also made it clear by implication that *succincta* can only be conserved in its accustomed sense by the suppression (under the plenary powers) of the Linnean holotype (no objective grounds having been shown for regarding the Linnean specimen in any other light) and by the designation of a neotype. On the other hand, the criticisms levelled at the designations of neotypes for *assectator* and *nigricorne* are justified; for the first has never been used as a valid name between 1846 and the opening of the present case, and no confusion exists about the interpretation of the second.

12. Uvarov's proposal to validate *succincta* as from Uvarov, 1923, offers a solution that can only be attained by accepting the fiction that such a nominal species as " *Patanga succincta* Uvarov, 1923 " exists and by extensive suppression of names and Willemse has pointed out the undesirability of this course in the present state of knowledge.

13. To sum up, three possible courses of action have been proposed to the Commission in this case. These are (a) Dr. Dirsh's original proposals, (b) the use of the plenary powers to the extent necessary to validate *succincta* as from Linnaeus, 1763, and (c) the validation of *succincta* as from Uvarov, 1923. In applying Article 70 to the case, the Commission will be concerned to designate " whichever species will in its judgment best serve stability and uniformity of nomenclature ". Specialists interested in the case are asked to write to me indicating their preference for one of the three alternatives set out below.

ALTERNATIVE A

(See Dirsh, 1966, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 235–8 with editorial corrections by Sabrosky, *ibid.*, **24** : 136).

ALTERNATIVE B

The Commission is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type-specimens

for the nominal species *Gryllus Locusta succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, hitherto made and to designate as neotype of that species the specimen described and figured by Dirsh, 1966, p. 236, pl. 2, figs. 1–7.

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (i) *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923 (gender: feminine), type-species, by original designation, *Gryllus Locusta succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, as defined in (1) above;
   (ii) *Valanga* Uvarov, 1923 (gender: feminine), type-species, by original designation, *Acridium nigricorne* Burmeister, 1838.

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (i) *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, as published in the combination *Gryllus Locusta succinctus*, and as defined in (1) above (type-species, by original designation, of *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923);
   (ii) *nigricorne* Burmeister, 1838, as published in the binomen *Acridium nigricorne* (type-species, by original designation, of *Valanga* Uvarov, 1923).

ALTERNATIVE C

The Commission is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers
   (a) to suppress the specific name *succinctus* Linnaeus, 1763, as published in the combination *Gryllus Locusta succinctus*, and all subsequent uses of the name before that of Uvarov, 1923, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
   (b) to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
      (i) *assectator* Fischer de Waldeheim, 1833, as published in the binomen *Acridium assectator*;
      (ii) *fusilinea* Walker, 1870, as published in the binomen *Cyrtacanthacris fusilinea*;
      (iii) *inficita* Walker, 1870, as published in the binomen *Cyrtacanthacris inficita*;
      (iv) *rubescens* Walker, 1870, as published in the binomen *Acridium rubescens*;
      (v) *elongatum* Walker, 1870, as published in the binomen *Acridium elongatum*;
   (c) to set aside all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923, made prior to the ruling now requested and to designate *succincta* Uvarov, 1923, as published in the binomen *Patanga succincta*, as the type-species of that genus;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
   (a) *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923 (gender: feminine), type-species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (c) above, *Patanga succincta* Uvarov;

(b) *Valanga* Uvarov, 1923 (gender: feminine), type-species by original designation, *Acridium nigricorne* Burmeister, 1838;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *succincta* Uvarov, 1923, as published in the binomen *Patanga succincta* (type-species under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above of *Patanga* Uvarov, 1923);
   (b) *nigricorne* Burmeister, 1838, as published in the binomen *Acridium nigricorne* (type-species, by original designation, of *Valanga* Uvarov, 1923);

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the six specific names suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) and (b) above.

14. Two side-issues have been raised during the discussion of this case. Dr. Key (*Bull.* **24** : 132) asks for a ruling on the authorship of the names published in Linnaeus's ' Centuria Insectorum ' (*Amoen. Acad.* **6**). This paper was presented for public discussion and defended by Boas Johansson, a pupil of Linnaeus, under Linnaeus's chairmanship, and the question is, which of them should be regarded as the author of the names? The names are attributed to Linnaeus by Sherborn (*Index Animalium*) and the authorship of the work is attributed to him by B. B. Woodward (*Cat. Lib. B.M.N.H.*, **2** : 935, 1904; **3** : 1145, 1910) and by B. H. Soulsby (*Cat. Works Linnaeus*, etc.; 1933, p. 101 (no. 1307), p. 142 (no. 2251)). Zoologists have attributed the names to Linnaeus and the Scandinavian authorities on Linnaeana regard him as the author of the work. Even if thorough research into all the circumstances were to show that Johansson ought to have the credit of publishing the work, standard authorities, and the interest of stability and uniformity of zoological nomenclature all lead to the conclusion that the Commission should regard Linnaeus as the author of the names. The Commission is therefore invited to add the title of the work to the Official List of Works in Zoological Nomenclature with an endorsement to that effect.

15. The second issue concerns the relative status of descriptions and type-specimens in determining the application of a name. The Commission has been asked to prepare a Declaration clarifying Article 61 on this point. The matter will accordingly be taken up through the Council of the Commission as soon as possible.